

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

JOHN SALAS, #820804,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 6:23-cv-147-JDK-KNM
	§	
ASST. WARDEN	§	
MICHAEL A. COLLUM, et al.	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff John Salas, a prisoner of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell, for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case.

On June 23, 2023, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the case be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b) and 1915(e)(2)(B) due to Plaintiff's failure to state a claim for which relief can be granted. Docket No. 18. A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff, who has not filed written objections despite being granted an extension of time to do so. Docket No. 22.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire

record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews her legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law.").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 18) as the findings of this Court. This case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice. All pending motions are **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

**Signed this**

**Oct 4, 2023**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE